

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present U.S. patent application. Claims 1-4, 7 and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1, 2, 14, 18 and 19 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Therefore, claims 1-19 remain pending.

### Claim Rejections -35 U.S.C. § 102

#### Rejections of Claims 1-4, 7 and 14-17 based on *Pierson*

Claims 1-4, 7 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,812,258 issued to Pierson (*Pierson*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claims 1-4, 7 and 14-17 are not anticipated by *Pierson*.

Claim 1 recites the following:

A laser module case comprising a snout through which an optical fiber assembly may be passed, wherein the optical fiber assembly includes an optical fiber disposed within a sleeve, the snout disposed through a wall of the case, wherein the optical fiber assembly is movable in X, Y and Z-directions within the snout so that the optical fiber may be aligned with a laser within the laser module case after the module case is closed.

Claims 14, 16 and 17 recite similar limitations.

*Pierson* discloses an adjustable four-axis coupler that adjusts the relationship of two optical components by the use of rotatable eccentric sleeves. See Abstract; col. 4, lines 50-53. The coupler includes an outer sleeve, an inner sleeve mounted within the outer sleeve, and an optical fiber installed within the inner sleeve. See col. 5, lines 15-33.

In *Pierson*, wheels are used to rotate the outer sleeve and the inner sleeve. See col. 5, lines 7-9 and lines 22-24. Rotation of these wheels moves the outer sleeve, inner sleeve and optical fiber. See col. 6, lines 5-56. *Pierson* does not disclose that the optical fiber assembly is movable in X, Y and Z-directions within the snout, as recited in claims 1, 14, 16 and 17. Consequently, *Pierson* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claims 1, 14, 16, and 17. Thus, claims 1, 14, 16 and 17 are not anticipated by *Pierson* for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 2-4 and 7 depend from claim 1. Claim 15 depends from claim 14. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claims 2-4, 7 and 15 are not anticipated by *Pierson* for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 2-4, 7 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

#### Claim Rejections -35 U.S.C. § 103

##### Rejections of Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 18 and 19 based on *Pierson* and *Uno*

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Pierson* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,074,682 issued to Uno et al. (*Uno*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 18 and 19 are not rendered obvious by *Pierson* in view of *Uno*.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that *Pierson* fails to disclose the limitations of claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 18 and 19. See Office Action, page 4, paragraph 4. The

Examiner cites *Uno* as disclosing the limitations of claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 18 and 19.

See Office Action, page 4, paragraph 4.

*Uno* discloses a semiconductor laser module and a method of positioning the components thereof. See col. 1, lines 49-51 and 56-58. As explained above, *Pierson* fails to disclose that an optical fiber assembly is movable in X, Y and Z-directions within a snout, as recited in claims 1 and 18, while claim 19 recites that the snout is movable in X, Y and Z-directions. Examiner does not assert that *Uno* discloses that an optical fiber assembly is movable in X, Y and Z-directions within a snout, or that the snout is movable in the X, Y and Z-directions. Therefore, *Uno* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Pierson* pointed out by Applicant.

Consequently, *Pierson* in view of *Uno* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claims 1, 18 and 19. Thus, claims 1, 18 and 19 are not rendered obvious by *Pierson* and *Uno* for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's interpretations of *Uno*. Discussion of such interpretations was not necessary to address Examiner's rejections in the Office Action. Applicant reserves the right to refute such interpretations if necessary in connection with subsequent office actions.

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12 and 13 depend from claim 1. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12 and 13 are not rendered obvious by *Pierson* in view of *Uno* for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Rejections of Claims 10-11 based on *Pierson* and *Takenaka*

Claims 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Pierson* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,381,499 issued to Takenaka et al. (*Takenaka*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claims 10-11 are not rendered obvious by *Pierson* in view of *Takenaka*.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that *Pierson* fails to disclose the limitations of claims 10-11. See Office Action, page 4, paragraph 5. The Examiner cites *Takenaka* as disclosing the limitations of claims 10-11. See Office Action, page 4, paragraph 5.

*Takenaka* discloses a light-emitting or light-receiving assembly that includes a lens mount, a unit holder and a laser mount. See Abstract; col. 5, lines 25-27. As explained above, *Pierson* fails to disclose that an optical fiber assembly is movable in X, Y and Z-directions within a snout, as recited in claim 1. Examiner does not assert that *Takenaka* discloses that an optical fiber assembly is movable in X, Y and Z-directions within a snout, or that the snout is movable in the X, Y and Z-directions. Therefore, *Takenaka* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Pierson* pointed out by Applicant.

Consequently, *Pierson* in view of *Takenaka* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by *Pierson* and *Takenaka* for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's interpretations of *Takenaka*. Discussion of such interpretations was not necessary to address Examiner's rejections in the Office Action. Applicant reserves the right to refute such interpretations if necessary in connection with subsequent office actions.


Claims 10-11 depend from claim 1. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claims 10-11 are not rendered obvious by *Pierson* in view of *Takenaka* for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

#### CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Dated: June 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph A. Pugh  
Reg. No. 52,137

TriQuint Semiconductor, Inc.  
2300 NE Brookwood Parkway  
Hillsboro, OR 97124  
(503) 615-9616